

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated September 9, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 10-14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,570,875 (hereinafter "HEDGE"). The Examiner further rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over HEDGE in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,661 (hereinafter "LARSON"). Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowable of claims 1-5, 7-9, 16, 17 and 29.

By way of this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 10 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 14 and 15. Claim 20 has been amended to improve form, and claims 14 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection of claims 10-15 and 20 is respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

In paragraph 3, the Office Action rejects claims 10-14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by HEDGE. Applicants have amended independent claim 10 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 14 and 15. Claim 20 has further been amended to incorporate similar subject matter to the subject matter of claim 15. The rejection of claims 10 and 20 is, therefore, addressed below with respect to the rejection of claim 15.

In paragraph 6, the Office Action rejects dependent claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over HEDGE in view of LARSON. Though claim 15 has been canceled by way of the present amendment, the subject matter of claim 15 has been incorporated into independent claim 10. Similar subject matter to the subject matter of claim 15 has also been

incorporated into independent claim 20. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to these claims.

In rejecting claim 15, the Office Action admits (pg. 5) that HEDGE does not disclose “the feature of masking the storing of the received data frame in the external memory when the received data frame corresponds to one of the one or more identified frames.” The Office Action, however, cites LARSON as allegedly disclosing this feature. Specifically, the Office Action cites to column 15, lines 32-51 of LARSON as allegedly disclosing this feature.

At column 15, lines 32-51, LARSON discloses:

As can be seen with reference to FIGS. 7 and 12, the transfer logic 615, in conjunction with the mask and load bits, manages the transfer of varying amounts of data from the external memory 460 to the packet data memory 610. Additionally, the data transfer occurs in accordance with a priority scheme. In the illustrated embodiment, the priority scheme entails transferring data into the corresponding buffers 635(a-n) of the slots 504 sequentially after the reverse bearer slot 504. Accordingly the priority scheme employed in the present invention ensures that new data will be fetched into buffers 635(a-n) in a timely manner after the detection of the reverse bearer slot 504. By making new data available to slots 504 (via the corresponding buffers 635(a-n)) that follow the reverse bearer slot 504, the present invention improves the overall throughput of the communications system 200, 400, since there will be fewer empty slots 504 for a given frame transmission. Once the buffers 635(a-n) of the packet data memory 610 have been loaded with new data, the WLL controller 440 of the WSU 310 transfers the data to the BTS 320.

This section of LARSON, thus, discloses the transfer of data from an external memory 460 to a packet data memory 610 using a priority scheme to improve the overall throughput of the system. This section of LARSON, however, does not disclose, or even suggest, “masking the storing of the received data frame in the external memory *when the received data frame corresponds to one of the one or more identified data frames,*” as recited in claim 10. The

section of LARSON cited by the Office Action has nothing to do with masking of the storage of a received data frame in an external based on the *received data frame's correspondence to one or more previously identified data frames*, as recited in amended claim 10. Contrary to the allegations of the Office Action, LARSON, thus, does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of HEDGE admitted by the Office Action. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that amended claim 10 patentably distinguishes over HEDGE in view of LARSON.

Amended claim 20 recites similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 10. Claim 20, therefore, patentably distinguishes over HEDGE in view of LARSON for similar reasons to those set forth above with respect to claim 10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



By: _____
Tony M. Cole
Registration No. 43,417

Date: December 9, 2005

Harrity & Snyder, L.L.P.
11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Main: (571) 432-0800
Direct: (386) 575-2713

Customer Number: **45114**